

T H E
Self Vindicator
 E X A M I N E D,

And his own *Vindication* weighed in
 the Ballance, and found too light.

With some Animadversions upon
 his E P I S T L E Dedicatory.

Being an Answer given by Mr. *John Wells*
 to the second Book written by Mr. *Thomas James*, of *Ashford* in *Kent*, intituled, *A Vindication*, &c.

To which is prefix'd
 An Epistle concerning Baptism.

Occasionally written, upon the sight of two
 Treatises, published by Mr. *Thomas James*,
 Teacher of a *Presbyterian* Congregation at
Ashford in *Kent* : Who hath reflected upon
 the Baptized Christians.

By a Lover of Primitive Christianity.

L O N D O N,
 Printed in the Year MDCXCVI.

P

B A

Occasional
of two

Mr. THO

Teacher
gation
hath
Christ

By WILL
Doctor,
9 Lover

for the
and
first for

Long time

A N
EPISTLE

Concerning

BAPTISM.

Occasionally written upon the sight
of two Treatises published by

Mr. *THOMAS JAMES*,

Teacher of a Presbyterian Congre-
gation at *Ashford* in *Kent*: Who
hath reflected upon the Baptized
Christians.

By *WILLIAM RUSSEL*, Medicinæ
Doctor, *Academiæ Cantabrigiæ*nsis,
A Lover of Primitive Christianity.

*Ask for the old Paths, where is the good
Way, and walk therein, and ye shall
find rest for your Souls, Jer. 6. 16.*

London, Printed in the Year 1696.

To those who
the adju
upon the
James

THE *Curse*
you a this
tion of the
which
call
challenged by the
over to a Book
Book, &c. the
In which Book
confederacy again
an equal, if not a
per-War he hath
And seeing it be
ence) to put it
Books of Ysaiah
Religion by Law,
was a wonder
richful Language
ture, for that
from the
Order of a Pres
According to the
Avers other
is done terms to
of it, and of our
You may think
provision, yet is
even the best
a reproachful

To those Inhabitants of Ashford, and the adjacent Parishes, who attend upon the Ministry of Mr. Thomas James.

THE Occasion of my writing this Epistle to you at this time, ariseth from the Consideration of two Books written by T. J. The one intituled, *Spira's Despair revived*. The other called, *A Vindication of that Part of it which is challenged by the Anabaptists, &c.* which is a pretended Answer to a Book written by J. W. in Answer to his first Book, &c. the latter of which he dedicates to you.

In which Book he brings you in as Parties with him, in confederacy against that People; as making you to have an equal, if not a greater Interest than him, in that Paper-War he hath raised against them.

And seeing it hath pleased God (by his good Providence) to put it into the Hearts of our King, and both Houses of Parliament, to give us the free Exercise of our Religion by Law, (which we esteem as a great Mercy) it was a wonder to me to read such scurrilous and reproachful Language, against those of our Perswasion; and the more, for that it proceeds from one who is himself a Dissenter from the established Religion of the Land, and a Teacher of a Presbyterian Congregation. And to find him publishing to the World, that the Inhabitants of *Ashford*, and divers other Parishes, did join issue with him in so doing; it seems to bespeak but little Sense of the Goodness of God, and of our Rulers, in the Liberty you enjoy.

Now whereas those Ministers that are of the Episcopal Perswasion, do give us civil Treatment, and do not concern themselves to disturb our Peace and Quiet, much less to reproach and abuse us: I was considering what should

move Mr. *Thomas James* to act as he hath done: And at last I concluded it must certainly proceed from that very Spirit and Principle of the first Founder of your Sect, Mr. *John Calvin*, who burnt the Books of *Servetus*, a Learned Baptist; and afterwards perswaded the Magistrates of Geneva to burn him alive. Which Sentence was executed upon him, as *Castellio* testifies (who was a Contemporary with him) in these words; Michael Servetus was burnt alive for his Opinion, at Geneva, Anno 1553, upon the 27th day of October.

And yet, as one well observes, Mr. *Calvin* did acknowledg this of him, That he was a Learned and a Charitable Man.

Notwithstanding this, he wrote a Book to justify their putting him to death, as a Man whose Books were full of Errors. Which Book was sufficiently confuted by the Learned *Castellio*; where he also shews that the Reason why *Calvin* procured his Death, was this, lest the excellent Parts and Learning of *Servetus* should have eclipsed the Glory of *Calvin*, and prevented him from being the Head of a Party. And yet *Castellio* was not a Baptist.

Now if Mr. *James* should have imbibed the same persecuting Principles, it is no wonder to find so much Rancour of Spirit appear in him against the Baptists in our Days, as he hath expressed in these two Treatises. I speak not this, as if I meant to accuse the whole Party; for I know that divers of them are meliorated, and have manifested themselves to be Men of better and more peaceable Principles. But seeing there are some young Men of another mind, I thought it not amiss to give you a Caution against it, remembering what an honest old Presbyterian Minister said once to some others of his Brethren, who met to ordain three young Ministers who had declared themselves for this persecuting Principle; saith he, "I will have no hand in their Ordination, for there are
" Firebrands enough in the World already; and (if it
" please God) I will have no hand in sending more, for
" such as they are enough to set the World in a Flame
" where-ever they come.

And I fear your young Man may be of that number. I pray let me ask you a few civil Questions; which I desire you to propound to him, and do you demand of him particular and distinct Answers thereunto.

I. Whe-

1. Whether Mr. *James* doth not believe the Episcopal Church of *England* to be a true Church? and their Teachers to be true Ministers?

2. Whether he doth not own their Baptism and Ordination to be true and valid?

3. Whether he doth not think it lawful for you to go to their publick Worship, and attend upon their Ministry in their Parochial Assemblies; rather than suffer Imprisonment, and the loss of your Estates? And if this be so,

Then, 4. what can be the Motive to excite *Thomas James* to keep up a Separation from the established Church of *England*, now in a Time of Peace? unless it be to get a better livelihood for himself, than he could otherwise obtain.

5. Whether the fear of losing some of his Auditors, or being hindred from an increase of their Number, by which his Income might be diminished, might not be the great Motive which excited him to such a foolish way of scribbling against the *Baptists*?

6. Whether it doth not therefore highly concern you, to make a diligent Enquiry into the Word of God, and examine his Doctrines thereby, that you may see whether they agree with the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles and Primitive Christians, lest you should be cheated, both of your Money and of your Souls?

Now, Sirs, if a prejudicate Opinion doth not interpose, I doubt not but it may be said of you as of those in *Acts* 13. 48. *τεταγμένοι εις*, you are disposed to eternal Life: And then there will be some hope, you will give credit to the Authority of God, in the Gospel of his dear Son, and be willing to learn what may be taught you.

Had not Mr. *James* opposed us in the Point of Holy Baptism, I had not concerned my self with him, believing he was sufficiently confuted about his Calumnies against our Friends at *Ashford* by another hand.

I shall therefore (for the sake of Truth) use my endeavour to elucidate the Point in controversy, that you may have a more clear and distinct knowledg of it.

Neither you nor your Teacher, ought to think it below you to be instructed in any Gospel-Truth, but receive it with meekness and humility; and be thankful to them that will take the pains to do it.

For *Apollos*, who was a great Preacher, and a Man mighty in the Holy Scriptures, did not disdain that a Woman should instruct him in the Way of God more perfectly, *Acts* 18. 24, 25, 26.

And for your better understanding the Point in Controversy, I shall do these three things.

I. Shew you, that Baptism is to be administered by Dipping, Plunging, or overwhelming the Person in Water.

II. That true penitent Believers are the right Subjects of Baptism.

III. That the Ordinance of Baptism is now in being, and is to continue to the End of this World.

I I shall shew that Baptism must be administered by Dipping, &c. if we consider these four things.

I. The Etymology, or Signification of the Word, the Holy Spirit uses to express it by.

2. Those Metaphors used in Holy Scripture, to represent it to our Understanding.

3. From the Practice of the first Baptizers.

4. From the grand Commission of our Saviour, *Mat.*
28. 19.

I. From the Etymology, or Signification of the Word.

The word *Baptism*, is from the Greek βαπτίζω, to dip. *Baptisma*, a Dipping; from βαπτω, *Bapto*, to dip, plunge, or drown. It implieth the washing of the whole Body; even such a washing as is used in Bucks, where Linen is plunged and dipt. For the native and proper signification of it, is to dip into Water, or to plunge under Water; see *Leigh's C. i. i. c. a. Sacra*.

It is a Metaphor taken from the use of the Dyers Vat ; and is such a Dipping, by which the Cloth put into it is dyed, and not a bare washing only ; from whence cometh Baptism.

Zepperus de Sacramentis saith, Βαπτισμὸς, Baptism; *se vocis notationem attendere velimus, vocabulum Baptismi missi-*
nem significat in aquam, &c. If we will attend to the No-
tation of the word *Baptism*, it signifies to dip into Water;
or the Act it self of Dipping and Washing. From hence
therefore, and from the Etymology of the Word it self, it
doth appear what was the Custom of administering Bap-
tism

tism from the beginning. Whereas now (saith he) we rather use Rantism (*viz.* Sprinkling) in the stead of Baptism, which is Dipping.

Alstedius in his *Lexicon Theologicum*, printed Anno 1612. pag. 310. saith thus, Βαπτισμός, & βάπτισμα, ἀπὸ τοῦ βάπτειν, *Tingere, lavare, inficere: unde deductum aliud verbum βάπτισεν, intingere, immergere, maxime quidem aquā. Illud βάπτισεν tantum significat immergere; non lavare, nisi ex consequenti.*

From whence it may plainly be seen, that this Learned Author doth assert, That Baptism is to dip, plunge, or overwhelm the Person baptized in Water: And that its proper signification is to dip, or dye, and not to wash, but only by Consequence. For which he cites for his Authority, both *Plutarch* and *Naxianzen*; as may be seen at large in the Book it self.

Besides this is so well known, that every School-boy in the Greek-Grammar can tell you, that βάπτω, *bapto*, is there rendred *mergo, immergo*, to dip, to plunge or overwhelm.

Also in a *Greek Lexicon*, published and recommended to all, for the encrease of Knowledg, by

Joseph Caryl,
George Cokayne,
Ralph Vening,
William Dell,

Matthew Barker,
William Adderly,
Matthew Mead, and
Henry Jessey,

They tell us, that the signification of βάπτω, is to dip, plunge, or drown. And in the Passive Voice, βάπτομαι, is to be plunged, or overwhelmed. And that βάπτισο, is to plunge, to overwhelm, to baptize, to dip. And in the Passive Voice, βάπτιζομαι, to be plunged, to be baptized, or dipped.

In *Clavis Græcæ Linguae*, printed at London, Anno 1640. it is thus rendred; βάπτω, ἵωφα, *mergo, tingo*, to dip, to dye. βάπτισο, *Id. m.* the same.

Βαπτισμός, & βάπτισμα, *mersio*, to drown; and therefore ἐμβάπτω, is often rendred, to dip into, to drown. And from thence the Latins use *mersus, à mergo*, drowned, covered, or overwhelmed with Water. And therefore it is used in the New Testament, for that Holy Ornaunce of

Baptism; it being performed by dipping the whole Body of the Person baptized under Water.

The Learned *Robertson*, (my singular good Friend) in his *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguae*, saith, *Baptizo, mergo. Bap̄w, Intingo, mergo, to dye, to dip, plunge, &c.* Hence (saith he) is *Baptizo*, which signifies the same. As also *Baptismos, Baptisma, &c.* But the Greek word *Παρίζω, Rantizo*, (he saith) is *aspergo*, to sprinkle.

Παντισμός, Rantismos, Aspersio, Sprinkling. So that you may easily discern, there is as much difference betwixt these two Greek words, *Baptismos* and *Rantismos* in Greek, as there is betwixt those two words, Dipping and Sprinkling in English; and therefore rarely, not to be conceived to be synonymous, i. e. to signify the same thing.

I now presume, from what hath been said, that if the word *Βαπτίζω*, and its Derivatives, are used in all places in the New Testament, where this Ordinance of Baptism is spoken of: Then it will follow, by an unavoidable Consequence, that Dipping is the right manner of Baptizing; and that Sprinkling is not Baptizing.

That it is so, will evidently appear from an Enumeration of Particulars. I will instance in some of the principal, when I come to shew you what was the Practice of the first Baptizers. But of that in its proper place.

I now come to treat of the second Particular under this Head, *viz.* Dipping the Persons baptized into Water, appears to be the right way of administering this Ordinance, if we consider the Metaphors used in Holy Scripture to express it by.

There are two I shall chiefly insist upon: 1. A Burial. 2. A Resurrection.

We are to consider, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath not burdened us under the Gospel, with a multitude of Ceremonies, as it was in that Oeconomy of the Jews under the Legal Dispensation: But only with some few, and those very significant; this being a more spiritual Dispensation.

As therefore the Holy Supper of our Lord in the breaking of the Bread, signifies the breaking of his Body; and the pouring out of the Wine, the shedding of his most precious Blood; and both of these in conjunction his Death, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *For as often as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's Death till he come.*

Even

Even so Holy Baptism doth shew forth his Burial and Resurrection; Rom. 6. 4. *Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into Death; that like as Christ was raised up from the Dead to the Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of Life.*

Now consider the Metaphor : when Men are dead, we bury them by covering the whole Body under Ground, and not by scattering or sprinkling a little Dust or Earth on their Faces only.

Sprinkling (you know) hath no resemblance to a Burial ; but dipping or plunging the whole Body under Water, is a most expresse and lively representation thereof.

But perhaps Humane Testimonies will please you and your Pastor, better than Divine. And therefore I shall give you the Opinion of some Learned Bishops to corroborate what I say, who may be supposed to understand the Original as well as Mr. *James*.

The late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, Dr. *John Tillotson*, saith, in his Sermon upon 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. " Antiently those
" who were baptized, put off their Garments, which
" signified the putting off the Body of Sin; and were im-
" mersed and buried in the Water, to represent the Death
" of Sin; and then did rise up again out of the Water,
" to signify their entrance upon a new Life; and to these
" Customs the Apostle alludes *Rom.* 6. 4.

Also Dr. *Fowler*, the present Bishop of *Gloucester*, in his Book of the *Scope of the Christian Religion*, interprets this Saying of the great Apostle, *Rom.* 6. 4. as follows;

" Christians being plunged into the Water in Baptism,
" signifieth their undertaking and obliging themselves in a
" Spiritual Sense to die, and be buried with Jesus Christ,
" (which Death and Burial consist in an utter renouncing
" and forsaking of all their Sins) that so answerably to
" his Resurrection, they may live a holy and godly Life.

Moreover, Dr. *Fer. Taylor*, late Bishop of *Down*, in his *Ductor Dubitantium*, lib. 3. cap. 4. saith thus:

" The Custom of the Antient Church was not Sprink-
" ling, but Immersion, in pursuance of the Sense of the
" word βαπτίζοντες, both in the Commandment and Ex-
" ample of our Blessed Saviour.

" And this (saith he) agrees with the Mystery of the
" Sacrament it self; for we are buried with him in Baptism,
" saith

“ saith the Apostle. The old Man is buried and drowned in
 “ the Immersion under Water: and when the baptized
 “ Person is lifted up from the Water, it represents the Re-
 “ surrection of the new Man to newness of Life.

To this I shall only add that other Divine Testimony of
 the Apostle Paul, Col. 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptism,*
wherein also ye are risen with him through the Faith of the Opera-
tion of God, who hath raised him from the Dead. And shall
 now proceed to the third Particular, viz.

3. It doth appear that Dipping is the right way of Bap-
 tizing, from the Practice of the first Baptizers.

The first mention of this Ordinance of Holy Baptism, we
 have in Mat. 3. 1. where *John the Dipper* is mentioned. And
 in ver. 6. it is written, *And were baptized of him in Jordan,*
confessing their Sins. The Greek word there is βαπτίζω; *to*
 which is in English, *They were dipped, plunged, or over-*
whelmed: for it is from the word βάπτω, *to dip, &c.*
 as I have already shewed.

In the 7th Verse, the word is βαπτισμα, which signifies
 the same.

In the 11th Verse βαπτίζω, *to dip, &c.*

In Verse the 13th βαπτισμας, *to be dipped.*

The Word is used again in ver. 14.

And the same also in the Passive Voice, is used in ver. 16.
 where it is said, *And Jesus, when he was baptized, &c.* And
 the following words do make that Sense evident; for when
 he was dipped by John in the River of Jordan, it is said,
He went up straightway out of the Water: Which implies,
 beyond contradiction, That he was in the River, and o-
 verwhelmed with the Water, according to the proper
 and native signification of the word βαπτίζω. And if
 you will read the 5th and 6th Verses of this Chapter, you
 will find there Multitudes thus baptized by John the Baptist,
 (or Dipper) for it's said, *Then went out to him Jerusalem,*
and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were
baptized of him in Jordan. The same is also testified in that
 parallel place, Mark 1. 4, 5. and the same Greek words
 used there as in Mat. 3. which I have above recited.
 And in Mark 1. 9. *Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan:*
 The Greek is Εἰς τὸ Ἰορδάνην, *into Jordan.* Now what
 Sense would this be? Jesus was sprinkled into Jordan. But
 to say, Jesus was dipt into the River of Jordan, is good
 Sense, as well as a great Truth.

Diodate,

Stoff's Acts and 977m
 154. 1. page 154.

Diodate, upon *Mat. 3. 6.* saith, *They were plunged in the Water.* And the Assembly in their *Annotations*, say, *Dipping in Jordan.* But because they are noted by Mr. Wells in his Answer, I shall forbear reciting them, and proceed to other Authors.

Cajetan saith, *Christ was baptized, not by Sprinkling, but by Dipping him into the Water.* And Piscator, on *John 3. 23.* *That Baptism was administred by dipping the whole Body in Water.*

Mr. Mede on *Titus 3. 5.* saith, "There was no such thing as Sprinkling used in Baptism in the Apostles Time, nor many Ages after them.

It is also the Observation of that late Learned and Pious Minister of Christ, Mr. *John Gosnold*, in his Book intituled, *Βαπτισμῶν Διδασκῆς*; "That Mr. *John Calvin*, up and down in his Works, doth often (with many others in our Days) confess, That the Ancient manner of Baptism in the Primitive Times was, by dipping the whole Body under Water. And also confesseth that the Church hath assumed this Liberty to her self, of using Sprinkling in the room thereof.

The same Author also observes, "That the Translators themselves never so much as once in all the New Testament renders it by Sprinkling. There is another Word for that, which they constantly translate to *sprinkle*, to wit, *Παρίζω*, *Rantizo*; whereby it's evident, Rantism is not Baptism, Sprinkling is not Dipping.

Besides, in all the Places that I have met with, where nothing of the stress of this Controversy depends, our Translators have every where rendred *βαπτίζω*, &c. to dip. For instance, in *Rev. 19. 13.* *He had his Vesture dipt in Blood.* And in *Mat. 26. 23.* *He that dippeth his Hand with me in the Dish.* *Luke 14. 24.* *That he may dip the Tip of his Finger in Water.* And in *John 13. 26.* it is twice used, *Βάψας*, dipped; *Καὶ ἐμβάψας*, and when he had dipped, *Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a Sop, when I have dipped it.* And when he had dipped the Sop, he gave it to *Judas Iscariot*, &c.

Moreover, if we will but consider the Places where this Holy Ordinance was administred by the first Baptizers, it will greatly elucidate this Truth.

For

For it was not practised in the Temple, nor in their Synagogues, nor yet in private Houses, in which it might have been done more commodiously, if sprinkling a few Drops of Water upon their Faces would have sufficed.

But they baptized in the River of Jordan, and other Places where there was much Water; because plunging the whole Body under Water did require it.

In John 3. 23. And John also (*βαπτίζων ἐν ᾿Αιβάδι*) was dipping in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much Water there; and they came and were (*ἐβαπτίσθησαν*) dipped. Now here we have the Reason given, why John baptized in this place, *i. e.* Because there was much Water. But if he had not plunged them into the Water, but only sprinkled them with a few Drops thereof, this Reason had been without Foundation. For as *Cornelius à Lapide* observes, A very little Water would have served to have sprinkled Thousands. But their manner of baptizing being to dip the whole Body under Water, therefore much Water was necessary thereunto, without which the Act of Baptizing could not be performed.

Now altho *T. J.* hath trampled upon our Reasons offered in justification of this Practice, I hope he will not make so bold with the Spirit's Testimony, as to contradict the Reason he hath given in the Text under Consideration.

Thus you see that John, who was the first Baptizer, and sent of God to dip Persons in Water, as the beginning of the Gospel, and to prepare Christ's Way before him; *Joh. 1. 33.* He that sent me (*βαπτίζειν*) to dip, plunge, or overwhelm in Water, meaning God the Father. Wherever there is mention made of his Baptizing, the same Words are used, either *Bapto*, or its derivatives.

If we observe what is said of our Saviour's Baptizing, (tho Jesus himself did not baptize (in his own Person) but by his Disciples) in every place the same Word is used; as *John 3. 22.* *καὶ ἐβαπτίζεν*. Also *John 4. 1, 2.* *βαπτίζεις, & ἐβαπτίζεν*; which all signify to dip, to be dipped, &c.

To proceed to the Practice of the Apostles, and chief Ministers of the Gospel, after our Lord's Resurrection, we shall find the same Word used (as above) in every place, where there is mention made of their Baptizing.

The

The first Instance is in *Acts* 2. 41. *Then they that gladly received his Word, were baptized, the word is βαπτίζουσιν.*

In *Acts* 8. 12. it is also from the same word βαπτίζοντο, *they were dipped, both Men and Women.*

And in *Acts* 8. 38, 39. βαπτίσας, *And he dipped him.*

It is here to be observed, that the Administrator *Philip*, as well as the Eunuch, went both down into the Water, (which had been needless, if Sprinkling would have served the turn); And when they came there, it's said, *He baptized him, i. e. dip't him.* And then it's further said, *They came up out of the Water*; not from the Side, or Surface of it, as Mr. *James* would insinuate, by distinguishing between from and out of; for here it is said expressly, *they came up out of the Water.*

Also in *Acts* 10. 48. βαπτισθήσας, *to be dipped, &c.*

To be short, There is, you see, an Account that *John the Baptist*, Christ (by his Disciples) when upon Earth, and his Apostles after his Resurrection, did all of them practise this Holy Ordinance of Baptism by dipping, or plunging the Persons baptized into the Water.

I will add to this the Testimony of Mr. *Dan. Rogers*; "None of old were wont to be sprinkled; And (saith he) "I confess my self unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for Infants sprinkling. And further, in his Treatise of the two Sacraments, *Part 1. Chap. 5.* he hath these words, "It ought to be the Church's Part to cleave to the "Institution, which is Dipping. And that he betrays the "Church, whose Officer he is, to a disordered Error, if "he cleave not to the Institution, which is to dip.

And this leads me to the 4th Particular, namely, That it will appear that Dipping is the right way of Baptizing, if we consider that grand Commission of our Saviour, *Mat. 28. 19.* the Greek word is βαπτίζοντες, from βάπτω to dip. And being given here by way of Precept, it is Dipping them. But seeing I have already explained the signification of the Greek words by which Baptism is signified, even to tediousness, both to my self and you, I shall insist no longer upon it.

As also, because I am of Opinion that the Gospel of *Matthew* was written in Hebrew, according to *Jerom's* Testimony, and the Opinion (I think) of most Learned Men. I shall therefore give you the words, so far as they concern

our

our Purpose, under this Head, as they are in that Language, in which I am sure it was spoken, if not written; It is **וַתִּבֶּלּוּ אֹתָם** *vetabelu Otam*; and dip ye them. The Root is *Tabil*, which is the third Person Singular in the Preterperfect Tense, and signifies, *he dipped*: And is so rendered in many places in Holy Scripture; particularly in 2 Kings 5. 15 where speaking of *Naaman the Syrian*, it is said, *He dipped himself in Jordan seven times, and was clean.*

In *Mat. 3. 6.* you have the same Word again in the Passive Voice, which must be rendered in English, *and were dipped of* in in Jordan. And in *Ver. 16.* you have the same Root again, as it is there applied to our Saviour; *And Jesus, when he was dipped, went up straightway out of the Water.*

Also in *John 3. 22, 23.* the same Word is used. And in *John 4. 1, 2.* it is the same in that Hebrew New Testament of Mr. *Robertson's*, who was certainly one of the most Learned Hebricians our Age hath afforded.

I might add to this the Testimony of the Dutch Translators, who call *John the Baptist*, *Johannes de Dooper*, *John the Dipper*; and in this Commission *de selve dopende*, dipping them. And if our Translators had generally (where that Word had occurred) turned it into English, as they have into Dutch, they had saved me and others the trouble.

Now if all this will not suffice, I know not what will. However I will make Mr. *James* one generous Offer; That if he can shew me where our Translators have in any one place rendered *Baptizo* to sprinkle; or *è contra*, have rendered *Rantizo* to dip, in the New Testament, I will grant him the Cause. And I do hope, if he cannot do it, he will own that we are in the right.

O, what a Tyrant Custom is! that dares stand up and contradict a thing that is so evident in it self, so agreeable to the Reason of the Ordinance, to the Etymology of the Word, (and that from the Pens of our Adversaries) and to the use of the Phrase and Expression in Holy Scripture, to the Commission of our Lord, to the Doctrine and Practice of the first Baptizers, both before and after our Saviour's Resurrection, and the manner of planting the Primitive Churches.

Not.

Notwithstanding all this (I say) Custom in a wrong Way, makes Men bold to oppose the right Way, altho they acknowledg it is the best.

In things civil and indifferent, I can be content that Custom should be my Guide, but not in the Matter of Ordinances, and things Sacred; the Rule of which lies in the Institution, (which we are strictly to observe) and is not in the Power of our Liberty or Choice, either to use or refuse: For that Blessing which attends the Use thereof, is annexed unto our Conformity to the Rule and Institution; see *Mat. 28. 20.*

But to proceed to the second General Head.

II. That true Penitent Believers are the right Subject of Baptism.

I shall make it good by doing these three things.

1st. By examining who *John the Baptist* (who was the first Baptizer) did admit to his Baptism.

2^{ly}, Who our Saviour commanded to be baptized, in that grand Commission *Mat. 28.*

3^{ly}, Who it was practised upon by the Apostles and first Ministers of Christ, pursuant to that Commission. And of these in their Order.

1st, Therefore let us examine who they were that *John* did admit to his Baptism.

The first Syllable we read of its being practised. is in *Mat. 3.* by *John the Dipper*, (so called by the Evangelist, *Via Eminentia*, as being the Beginner of that Holy Ordinance) where we have an Account, in *Ver. 2.* what Doctrine he preached before he baptized, *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* And in *ver. 5.* *Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan.* *Ver. 6.* *Kai ēbaptizōnto en tō Iordān;* And were plunged (of him) into Jordan, confessing their Sins. The Hebrew word also, is *Vaitabelu*, and were dipped, &c.

Upon this I shall observe some things, and so pass on.

1. That those he baptized were Adult Persons, (and not Infants) for they went out to him.

2. That they were penitent Persons, such that confessed their Sins.

3. That

3. That no others were admitted to his Baptism.

For, in ver. 7. it's said, *But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his Baptism, he said unto them, O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? Bring forth therefore Fruits meet for Repentance.*

4. That no Birth-Privileges will entitle any Person to that Holy Ordinance without Repentance.

For the Baptist tells them, in ver. 9. *Think not to say within your selves, We have Abraham to our Father. And (in ver. 10.) now also the Ax is laid to the Root of the Tree; therefore every Tree (i. e. every Person) which bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewen down and cast into the Fire.*

And to inform them more fully of the Nature of his Commission, and the Qualifications of the Subjects, he further saith, *I indeed baptize you with Water (unto, or as the Original hath it) upon Repentance.*

Which agrees most exactly with the Design of John's Ministry, he being to make ready a People prepared for the Lord; Repentance being a necessary Qualification, without which they could not be admitted thereunto.

But some may query, How I prove they were to believe as well as repent?

I answer, in the words of the Apostle Paul, Acts 19. 4. *John verily did baptize with the Baptism of Repentance, saying unto the People, That they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.*

From all which it appears, beyond dispute, That no little Infants were the Subjects of John's Baptism. For,

1. They could not come from *Jerusalem* to the River of *Jordan*, and desire to be baptized.

2. Nor could they confess their Sins.

3. Nor yet be able to understand his Preaching, with the Nature and Design of his Baptism.

4. Nor, lastly, could they be expected to bring forth Fruits worthy amendment of Life.

All which agrees only to Adult Persons; they can repent, they can believe in Christ, they can confess their sinful Deeds, and come to tender themselves for Baptism, (as all those did whom John baptized) which things little Infants are not capable to perform: Therefore Penitent Believers (and not Infants) were the right and only proper Subject of John's Baptism.

2ly, I shall consider the grand Commission of our Lord, Mat. 28. 18, 19, 20. And *Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World. Amen.*

That the Gospel of *Matthew* was written in Hebrew, (as I have touched above) I find it to be the Opinion of divers Men, eminently Learned: And among others, *Hierom*, in the Life of this Evangelist, saith, *Matthæus quæ & Levi ex publicano Apostolos, primus in Judæa propter eos qui ex Circumcisione crediderunt Evangelium Christi, Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit.* And further notes, *In quo animadvertendum, quod ubicumque Evangelista sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris, veteris Scripturæ testimoniis utitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum auctoritatem, sed Hebraicum.* Here you see he tells us, That the Gospel of Christ by *Matthew*, for the sake of those of the Circumcision that believed, was written in Hebrew Words, and Hebrew Letters. And that he every-where, in his Quotations out of the Old Testament, followed the Hebrew, and not the Septuagint Translation.

In Mr. *William Robertson's* Hebrew New Testament, I find these words between the 18th and 19th Verses, which I do not find in any Greek Copy.

וְכֵן אֵשֶׁר שְׁלַחְנִי אֲבִי נִכְרָה
אֲנִי שֹׁלֵחַ אֲתֶכֶם

And as my Father hath sent me, even so also I send you. Go ye therefore, &c.

I pray observe in what a solemn manner our Saviour begins this Commission.

1. By declaring his own Authority; *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to me.*

2. The Fulness of that Authority he gave to his Apostles; *As the Father hath sent me, even so also I send you.*

He then comes to give forth the Commission it self, as in the 19th and 20th Verses.

The first thing in this Commission is this, Christ commands them to make Disciples by their Ministry. The Word that is translated *Teach*, is in the Hebrew **למד** *Velamedu*, it signifies to make Disciples by teaching; for the Root is *Lamad*, he learned. And from thence is formed the Hebraïque Noun *Talmid*, a Scholar or Disciple, one that hath learned.

The plain meaning therefore is, That they were first to make Disciples by their Ministry, and after that to baptize them.

If we also examine the Greek Copy, we shall find it to agree with the Hebrew; **Ποιᾶτε μαθητάς** *poia desvles en mathetousate* πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς ἐς. That word upon which the whole Stress of the Argument depends, is *Mathetousate*, which signifies, to make Disciples. The Learned render *Mathetes*, a Scholar, a Disciple; and *Matheteno*, to be a Scholar, or Disciple. And upon this word in this place, the Greek *Lexicon* renders it, *to make Disciples*.

But if Mr. *James* will not believe our *Lexicographers*, I can give him the Opinion of all the Translators of the New Testament for it, who have rendred it so in a multitude of Places; and so far as I have found, in every place where the word is used, except only in this Commission, and here, (for some Reason best known to themselves) instead of Disciples, they have only rendred it *Teach*. And that which is most remarkable, they have five times in this Chapter rendred it *Disciples*, till they came to the 19th Verse, and there only it must be rendred *teach*; as in ver. 7, 8, 9, 13, and 16. And in *John* 4. 1, 2. *Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John, but his Disciples*; in both which the same word is used.

And I pray observe the Order of the words, They were first made Disciples, and afterwards baptized; as a prerequisite to fit them for that Holy Ordinance.

Also in *Acts* 11. 26. The Disciples are called *Christians*. And ver. 20, 21. it's said, how the same Persons came to be Disciples, The Lord Jesus was first preached to them; upon this, a great Number believed, and turned to the Lord. And thus they were made Disciples, according to Christ's Commission.

Besides,

Besides, in *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.* This place is parallel in Time with *Mat.* 28. 19. And whereas in *Matthew* is required Discippling, there is required in *Mark* Believing, and both before Baptism; It's therefore plain, they must be believing Disciples. And Faith comes by hearing; and therefore the Apostles were,

1. To preach to them; as in *Mark* 16. 15. *Preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

2. By their Preaching to make them Disciples.

3. Being so made, to baptize them.

This is the genuine Sense of our Lord's Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19.

Say some, they own they must first be made Disciples, and afterwards baptized. But then they ask this Question, How do we know that little Infants are not made Disciples, by some secret Teaching of God?

And supposing this to be true, of those who are born of believing Parents, they conclude they may be baptized.

I answer; For Argument's sake, I will for once suppose with them; that not only the Infants of Believers, but all Infants, so soon as they are born into the World, are made Disciples by some secret Teaching of God, (but how we shall prove either of our Suppositions, I know not); Nevertheless I deny that they are therefore to be baptized by virtue of this Commission. And how any mortal Man can know of this secret Work upon their Souls without Revelation, I can't imagine.

But pray consider a few things, and it will set the Truth we contend for in a clear Light. As,

1. It was Christ the Son of God who gave this Commission. *And Jesus came and spake.*

2. Who did he give it unto? Not to his Father to make Disciples of little Infants, by some secret Teaching of his, but to his Apostles that were Men, to make Disciples by their Ministry; *He spake unto them.*

The Conclusion is natural; which I shall form into this short Syllogism.

If little Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men ;

Then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in this Commission.

But little Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men ;

Ergo, They cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in this Commission.

The *Major* is undeniable, the *Minor* I thus prove.

If little Infants have no knowledg to discern between Good and Evil, then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

But they have no knowledg to discern between Good and Evil ;

Ergo ; They are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

The *Minor* only is questionable, which I prove by Divine Authority, Deut. 1. 39. *Moreover your little Ones—and your Children, which in that Day had no knowledg between Good and Evil.*

So that the first Argument is made good, viz. That little Infants cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in this Commission.

Whereas some of our Antagonists say, the word *them* relates to all Nations : As they confute themselves, by refusing to baptize Turks and Jews, before they own Christ ; so that they cannot extend it universally : Even so it appears, the word *them*, hath no reference unto all Nations, if they will but mind the Grammar of the Text.

For ἀὐτοὶς, *them*, is of the Masculine Gender, (but παῖς τὰ ἔθνη, all Nations, is of the Neuter) and agrees with μαθητεύσατε, *Disciples* ; and must have reference to them, as the only Persons fitted for Holy Baptism.

But to proceed,

3ly, I shall shew you who it was practised upon by the Apostles, and first Ministers of Christ, pursuant to the grand Commission.

We

We find all along in the History of the *Acts of the Apostles*, that Baptism was practised upon grown Persons, that were Disciples of Christ, having gladly received their Preaching, repented of their Sins, and believed the Gospel, which Infants are not capable to perform.

Acts 2. 38. Repent, and be baptized. Ver. 41. Then they that gladly received his Word, were baptized. Ver. 44. And all that believed were together.

Acts 8. 12. When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both Men and Women, not little Infants. In ver. 36. After Philip had preached Jesus to the Eunuch, (according to Christ's Commission) they came unto a certain Water; and he asked Philip, What did hinder him to be baptized? Philip answers, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And upon that Profession of his Faith, he was immediately baptized. So that we may learn hence, That Faith is a pre-requisite of Baptism; for Philip requires Faith of the Eunuch, before he would baptize him.

So in the Jaylor's Case, *Acts 16. 31. Paul requires of him, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. And in ver. 33, 34. it's said, he was baptized, believing in God, &c.*

Acts 18. 8. Crispus believed on the Lord; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. If these Testimonies are not sufficient, I know not what will.

I could in this place produce divers Testimonies from the Learned (were it needful) to prove that no Infants were baptized for about two hundred Years from Christ. See Dr. Barlow's Testimony: "There is (saith he) no just Evidence of Infant-Baptism, till about two hundred Years after Christ.

The Learned *Curcellæus* affirms, "That the Custom of baptizing Infants, was brought in without the Commandment of Christ, and did not begin before the third Century.

Grotius, on *Mat. 19. 13.* gives this Account; "That according to the Rule of Scripture, and agreeing with Reason it self, the most part of the Greeks in all

“ Ages, even unto this Day, retain a Custom of delay-
 “ ing Infant-Baptism, till they themselves can give a
 “ Confession of their Faith. And it is certain that Na-
 “ zianzen, though the Son of a Christian Bishop, who li-
 “ ved about the fourth Century, and was bred up in the
 “ Christian Religion, was not baptized till he was about
 “ thirty Years of Age.

The same is also true of *Chrysostom*, *Hierom*, *Ambrose*,
Augustine, and others.

And as the Learned Dr. *De-Veil* observes, it does mani-
 festly appear, “ That the wisest of our Fathers in Christ,
 “ did not come to Baptism, until they were come to
 “ a strong and confirmed Age and Wit. So that (it’s
 “ plain) they were not baptized in their Infancy. Yea,
 “ further he saith, I could never read of so much as one of
 “ the Antient Fathers, for six hundred Years after Christ,
 “ that was baptized in his Infancy.

Ludovicus Vives affirms, in his *Treatise de Civitate Dei*, Lib.
 I. cap. 27. *Neminem olim consuevisse baptizari nisi adulta eta-
 te, & qui per se peteret baptismum, & intelligeret quid sit
 baptizari.* None of old Time were wont to be baptized
 but in a grown Age, and who desired it themselves, and
 understood what it was to be baptized.

Erasmus in his *Annotations* on the Epistle to the Romans,
 affirms, “ That baptizing of Children was not in use in
 “ Paul’s Time.

And Dr. *Field*, in his learned *Treatise of the Church*,
 pag. 729. affirms, “ That many very antiently, who were
 “ born of Christian Parents, put off their Baptism a long
 “ Time; insomuch as some were elected Bishops before
 “ they were baptized. As we read (saith he) of *Am-
 brose*, &c.

The Learned *Bossuet*, speaking of the manner of admi-
 nistring Baptism, saith, “ We never read in the Scripture,
 “ that any were baptized otherwise than by Immersion.
 “ And we are able to prove, from the Acts of Councils
 “ and antient Rituals, that every-where in the whole
 “ Church throughout the World, for the space of 1300
 “ Years, Baptism was never administred but by Dip-
 “ ning, except only in Cases of Necessity.

And

And *Bellarmino* saith, "Infant-Baptism is called an *Apostolical Tradition* not written, because it is not found written in any Apostolical Book. *Tom. 1. lib. 4. cap. 2.*

Where by the way I shall note, That if a Man of his Parts and Learning could not find it there, I believe others will have as little Success in their search after it : And it had been his Interest to have proved it from Scripture as much as any, because none lay a greater stress upon it than he, and those of his Religion ; for they assert it to be necessary to Salvation.

Let Mr. *James* know, we do not bring the Testimonies of Humane Writers, because we think the Holy Scriptures insufficient to justify our Cause. For I may say with *Tertullian*, *Lib. contra Hermogenem*, *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem*, &c. I adore the Fulness of the Scripture, let *Hermogenes* shew that it is written.

But to satisfy the World that we are not singular in our Judgments about these Matters, as also to obviate an Objection of your Pastor, who tells us in his last Treatise, *Pag. 20*, "That at the rate some *Baptists* write and report the Words of the Learned, they would persuade silly People, all the Learned Men were almost *Anabaptists*, and *αὐτοκατακρίντες*, self-condemned, being as they are in Opinion, though of a contrary Practice.

I answer, That although they are of a contrary Practice, I hope that can be no Bar to us from reciting their words in favour of our Opinion ; For, *Firmum est genus probationis, quod ab ipso adversario sumitur, ut veritas, ab ipsis inimicis veritatis probetur*. It is a forcible kind of Proof, which is taken from the Adversary himself, when the Truth is proved from them that oppose the Truth. And I have herein followed the Counsel of *Lactantius*, *lib. 1. c. 6. Eos suorum Testimoniis revincere*, &c. To convince them by their own Testimonies, which is the strongest Conviction that may be.

As it is truly said by *Chrysostom*, *Tunc illos maxime revincimus, cum suorum, in eos, dicta retorquemus*. We do most forcibly convince them, when we can retort their own Sayings against them.

And therefore as *Lactantius, de vera sapientia, cap. 12.* saith, *Satis firmum Testimonium, ad probandam veritatem, quod ab ipsis perhibetur inimicis.* That is a sound Argument for the proving of the Truth, which is fetched from the Enemies of the Truth.

Yea, suppose it were but weak in it self, yet it hath great weight against him that brings it. For, as the Roman Orator observes in the like Case; *Tuum Testimonium, quod, in alienare, leve est; in tua, quoniam contra te est, gravissimum esse debet.* Thy Testimony, which is but light and frivolous in another Man's Cause, yet is weighty in thine own, when it is against thy self.

Now I fancy that the Reason why Mr. *James* would not have us urge the Testimonies of the Learned, for fear of shewing how contradictory some of their Opinions have been to their Practices, is, lest in so doing he also should be found to be *ων αὐτοκατακρίει*, condemned of himself; and that in many places of his Book, particularly, when he brings a Poet to prove, that Christ was not baptized by Dipping.

And in *Pag. 20.* he saith, “ I would fain know who can prove our Lord Jesus Christ was dipped, or plunged, in his Baptism; or any of those baptized Ones spoken of in the New Testament, were so dipped, or plunged ?

I will give you the Opinion of some Learned Men upon it in this very Place, altho I have said sufficient to it elsewhere; and then shew you how Mr. *James* is condemned by his own Pen.

“ Now if any one (saith *Maldonate*) ask why the Evangelists use the Word of *Ascending* ? &c. It was because Christ ascended, or went up out of the Water, in the which he had been dipt or drowned.

Lucas Brugensis, saith upon the Place, *Matth. 3. 16.* “ Christ descended into the River (after the manner of others that were baptized) as deep as his Thighs, or his Navel, for the rest of his Body was dipt by *John*, and not sprinkled only with Water.

And the Learned *Cajetan* tells us upon the Place, “ Christ ascended out of the Water; therefore Christ was baptized by *John*, not by Sprinkling, nor by pouring Water upon him, but by Immersion, that is, by dipping or plunging in the Water. Many

Many more Testimonies might be brought from Men, who use Rantism instead of Baptism, but that I have already exceeded my first Intention. But I shall now shew you, that Mr. *James* (like the rest of those I have quoted) hath contradicted himself: For in the same 20th Page of his Book, where he vapours so mightily, and challenges us to prove, that Christ, or any others, were baptized by Dipping, as you have seen above; yet presently he tells us, That Baptism was oft performed by Dipping, I gainsay not. And in the very next Page he saith, I do not produce these Testimonies, as tho I would maintain that our Lord Jesus was not dipped. It seems his Conscience began to check him whilst he was writing.

And again, in *Pag. 25*. Who speaks against the Antiquity of *Dipping*? I thought Mr. *James* had. But he goes on, *Dipping* there might be in Christ's Time, and that the best way of Baptizing. Very well, then it seems we practise the most Antient, and the best Way of Baptizing, by Mr. *James's* Acknowledgment: And himself doth practise the contrary, and therefore must needs be self-condemned, as practising the worst Way; especially if he will consider, That there is neither Precept nor Precedent for Infant-Sprinkling in all the Word of God.

But to close this Head I am upon: If this be true, that none of the Apostles, nor first Ministers of the Gospel, did ever practise the Sprinkling of Infants; there must be some good Reason why they did it not: And the best I can think of is, because Christ had not commanded them so to do. But on the contrary, had commanded them to baptize Penitent Believers, which were Persons of grown Years; to which Command they were obedient.

And we have great Reason to account them faithful: For the Apostle *Paul* protests, before an Assembly of Ministers, *Acts 20. 20*. He had kept back nothing that was profitable to them. And in *ver. 26*. he saith, I have not shunned to declare to you all the Counsel of God. If therefore the Sprinkling of Infants had been profitable for them, or a part of the Counsel of God concerning the Churches, we had certainly heard of it in some of *Paul's* Speeches or Epistles: But not one Word being mentioned about

about it, we may safely conclude, it was wholly unknown to those Times, (both as to Subjects and Manner) it being a Practice both unprofitable and vain, as being built upon Humane Authority only, having no Foundation in the Word of God : *In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, Mat. 15. 9.*

I will offer an Argument or two, to prove that Infant-Sprinkling is not of Divine Authority.

The Sprinkling of Infants, is either from Heaven, or of Men.

But it is not from Heaven : *Ergo*, It is of Men.

If it be from Heaven, the Holy Scriptures have somewhere revealed it so to be.

But it is no where so revealed in the Holy Scriptures : *Ergo*, It is not from Heaven.

If it be any where so revealed in the Holy Scriptures, you, or some other, are able to shew it.

But you, nor no other are able to shew it : *Ergo*, It is not any where so revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

If Mr. *James* should tell you he can shew it so to be, let him give you an Instance where it is written, as a Logician ought to do, (the *Minor* being an Universal Negative) or let him for ever be silent upon this Subject : For it is written, *Rev. 22. 18. If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book.*

I cannot well go off of this Head, without taking notice of a pernicious Notion which some of the Learned have espoused.

They will allow us that we are in the right, as to what we assert about the practice of the Primitive Churches ; but tell us, that their Ceremonies may be lawfully used also, which they ground upon this following Supposition ; That it is lawful for Men to bring in things indifferent into the Church, and join them with the Worship of God.

And as this refers to the Point of Baptism, I will briefly relate what past some Years ago, betwixt Dr. *Barlow* late Bishop of *Lincoln*, and my self. It was upon this Occasion ;

(27)
 it is a Point of
 and command
 Child baptized
 such Men con
 and told him, my
 separate Commu
 Truth of Man
 Lordship though
 Christian.
 He told me, "Yes,
 about it in his own
 he was satisfied
 I desired then to know
 instances
 it said, "The Apostles
 giving, entered the
 higher Powers, etc.
 Submit you just to
 Lord's sake, he
 that the Communion
 should be baptiz
 asked : And then
 I said to every
 therefore we ought
 I answered ; My
 said, and the King
 should have been
 in the Name of the
 before this people
 He answered, "Th
 I reply'd, As well
 Controversy had
 it said, "That is
 this now ?
 I said, They have
 in the Power of
 all, to alter the
 believe that is
 in itself Divine
 Baptiz'd ; "T
 a balance of

Occasion ; A Name-sake of mine being taken up upon a *Capias*, and committed to *Ailesbury* Goal, for not having his Child sprinkled, I went to his Lordship (after several Months confinement) to desire his Discharge ; and told him, my Friend was not a Member of any separate Congregation, but only doubted of the Truth of Infant-Baptism, which I supposed his Lordship thought he might do, and yet be a good Christian.

He told me, " Yes, for he had rumblings and tossings " about it in his own Mind in his younger Days, but now " he was satisfied.

I desired then to know the Grounds of his Lordship's Satisfaction.

He said, " The Apostle *Paul*, in *Rom. 13.* and the beginning, exhorted the Christians to submit to the " Higher Powers, &c. And also the Apostle *Peter* said, " Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man, for the " Lord's sake, &c. Now (saith he) you must know " that the Convocation met and concluded, that Infants " should be baptized ; and the King and Parliament enacted it : And forasmuch as we are required to be obedient to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake, " therefore we ought to do it.

I answered ; My Lord, If the Convocation had so concluded, and the King and Parliament so enacted, That Infants should have been baptized in the King's Name, or in the Name of the King and Parliament as Legislators, I believe those People might have complied with it.

He answered, " That would have been odd.

I reply'd, As odd as it is, if they had comply'd with it, the Controversy had been at end.

He said, " That is true ; But why cannot they comply " with it now ?

My Lord, They have got a Notion in their Heads, that it is not in the Power of any Man, or number of Men in the World, to alter the Nature of Institutions, so as to make that Divine that is in it self Humane, or that Humane that is in it self Divine.

The Bishop reply'd ; " They are right in that, for none " can alter the Nature of things but God alone.

Why

Why then, my Lord, forasmuch as you do not baptize Infants in the Name of the King, or King and Parliament, as an Humane Institution, but in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as a Divine Institution, they cannot comply with it.

" Well (saith he) there is never a Word of God against it : It is no where said in the Scriptures ye shall not baptize Infants.

I reply'd ;

My Lord, I shall only put your Lordship in mind of the Notes of a Learned Man upon that of *Lev. 10. 1, 2.* concerning *Nadab and Abihu*, Sons of *Aaron*, Priests of the Lord ; who offered strange Fire before the Lord, which the Lord commanded them not. He saith, It is not sufficient to say about instituted Worship, It is nowhere forbidden : For it was nowhere said before this time ; *Ye shall not offer up strange Fire upon mine Altar.* But because there was a Divine Precept, what Fire they should offer, what Perfume they should mix with their Sacrifices, and the manner of its Composition : And they not observing that Divine Precept ; but offering strange Fire, which the Lord commanded them not, they were destroyed by Fire from his Presence. His Lordship only gave me this Answer ; He would speak to his Official, to be kind to my Friend that was in Prison, &c. but wholly waved the Matter in Controversy ; and so I took my leave, and departed.

I mention not this, as if I thought this Learned Man singular in this Point ; for it is too manifest, that many others are of the same Sentiments, without which they could not satisfy their Consciences in the Practice of Infant sprinkling, and other things which they also practise without either Precept or Precedent from the Word of God.

There are many things very ridiculous, that have by Degrees been brought into the Church ; of which it is no where said in the Holy Scriptures, they shall not be done. And that about this very Ordinance as well as in other Matters.

As for instance ;

1. Where is it forbidden to baptize Bells ? This hath been

... by ...
Where is it ...
... once ...
3. Where is it ...
the Parish do ...
and say, in the ...
4. Where is it ...
Month, as they ...
That his Word ...
5. And where ...
And yet how ...
Mr. Jones may ...
... of a Church ...
... they left ...
... all passed ...
... the Church ...
... which he leaves ...
... him if this Work ...
... not be read ...
... as they ...
... and the Waters ...
... and on the left ...
... to conclude, the ...
... little Children ...
... sometimes, who ...
... his Place ?
But Mr. Jones ...
... of Children ...
... Sprinkling ...
... the casting of ...
... doubt not of it ; ...
... for the Dutch Tr ...
... thus ; Ends all ...
... slips into ...
... speak as Sch ...
... how it comes ...
... I cannot imagine ...
... I pray ask ...
... would him ...
... the use of ...

been practised by the Popish Priests, and that very lately.

2. Where is it forbidden to use the Sign of the Cross in Baptism? as the Popish Priests do thrice, and the Episcopal once.

3. Where is it forbidden to use Cream and Spittle, as the Papists do, to anoint the Childrens Eyes, Nostrils, and Ears, in their Practice of Baptism?

4. Where is it forbidden to put Salt in the Child's Mouth, as they also do? and give this Reason for it, That his Words may be with Grace, seasoned with Salt.

5. And where is it forbidden to baptize your Cattle? And yet how ridiculous would it be so to do? But perhaps Mr. *James* may pretend Scripture for it, from his Interpretation of 1 *Corinth.* 10. 2. For all their Cattle (of which they left not a Hoof behind) were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea; and were all baptized unto Moses, in the Cloud and in the Sea. The Word is ἐβαπτίσαντο, which he leave to Mr. *Wills* to interpret. And I pray ask him if this Word, as here used in the passive Form, may not be read thus; And they were all overwhelmed unto Moses, as they must needs be when the Cloud covered them, and the Waters were a Wall to them on the Right-hand and on the left. So that you see here is the same Ground to conclude, their Cattle were all baptized as well as their little Children: But if the Word had been translated *overwhelmed*, who could have dreamt of a Baptism from this Place?

But Mr. *James* will have it that there was a Multitude of Children baptized by Moses, and that it was done by Sprinkling also, through the dropping of the Cloud, and the dashing of the Waters; and that many learned Men doubt not of it; but hath not quoted one of them. I am sure the Dutch Translators, who were Presbyterians, read it thus; *Ende alle in Mosen Gedoopt Zin*; And they were all dipt unto Moses: And all learned Men do tell us, when they speak as Scholars, that βαπτω, is *mergo, immergo*; and how it comes to lose its Signification in this one Place, I cannot imagine.

But I pray ask Mr. *James* these few things;

1. Who told him there was Water in that Cloud? For in the Epistle of *Jude* ver. 12. we read of Clouds without Water:

Water: and we must remember that this Cloud was by a Miracle.

2. If it had Water, who told him that it dropped upon the Children of *Israel* whilst they past through the Red-Sea? His *ipse dixit* will not do where the Scripture is silent.

3. How came he to know that the Waters dasht upon them? I cannot suppose that he was present to see it: And if it be nowhere written, 'tis but an improbable Guess.

But to leave off these trifling Fancies of Mr. *James's*; let us see how it is written, *Exod. 14. 21. The Lord made the Sea dry Land, and the Waters were divided.*

Ver. 22. And the Children of Israel went into the midst of the Sea upon the dry Ground, and the Waters were a Wall unto them on their Right-hand and on their Left.

Ver. 29. And they walked upon dry Land in the midst of the Sea.

Chap. 15. 8. The Waters were gathered together; The Flood stood upright as an Heap, and the Depths were congealed in the Heart of the Sea.

Psalms 106. 9. He rebuked the Red-sea also, and it was dried up; so he led them through the Depths as through the Wilderness.

Thus you see here is not one Word of Sprinkling, or of dashing the Water upon them. As to the Cloud it was no common Cloud, but a Cloud that did constantly attend them in their passage through the Wilderness; see *Exod. 13. 21, 22. And the Lord went before them by Day in a Pillar of a Cloud, &c.* He took not away the Pillar of the Cloud by day, nor the Pillar of Fire by night, from before the People. See also *Numb. 14. 14.* Now if the Waters were a Wall on each side, and the Cloud covered them, then they must need be overwhelmed. *Psalms 105. 39. He spread a Cloud for a Covering, and Fire to give Light in the Night.* But not one Word of this Cloud's having Water in it, nor of its dropping upon them. What Cause have you to be cautious, how you admit any thing for Truth upon the Credit of your Teacher; who can allow himself the Liberty to talk at this loose Rate about sacred things? Besides, if this be to be understood of Baptism as an Ordinance,

nance, according to the Use of the Word in the New Testament; then I affirm (according to Mr. James's Logick) if their Infants were baptized, all their Cattle were likewise baptized: But I hope he will be ashamed and blush at such an Exposition; for besides all other Absurdities that attend it, *Moses* is hereby made the first Baptizer, and not *John the Baptist*. But I shall leave this, and pass to the third and last general Head.

III. That the Ordinance of Baptism is now *in* being, and is to continue to the End of the World.

Matt. 28. 20. *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even to the End of the World.*

Now this Ordinance of Baptism in Water, being one of those things he hath commanded, as in the Words foregoing; then the Apostles were to teach all the succeeding Churches to observe it, they being to teach them to observe all things he had commanded them; and to which also the Promise of Christ's Presence is annexed until the End of the World: The Ordinance it self is therefore to continue till that time.

Besides, it was the Care of the Apostles, not only to teach that present Age the Will of Christ, but also to have it continued to succeeding Ages: see 2 Tim. 2. 2. *Paul's Charge here to Timothy is, The things which thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.* And our Lord saith to those faithful ones in *Tbyatira*, Rev. 2. 24, 25. *I will put upon you none other Burden; But that which ye have already, hold fast till I come.*

But seeing we differ not about its Duration, (although we do about the Subjects, and the right Manner of administering the same) I shall add no more upon this Head. Had I been concerned with another sort of People, I should have thought my self obliged to have insisted more largely upon it.

I beseech you consider what I have said; for it is in true Love to your Precious Souls; that you may no longer

ger be deceived by false Teachers who handle the Word of God deceitfully : But that you may come to understand the true Doctrine of the Gospel, and imbrace that Faith which was once delivered to the Saints ; which was at first spoken by the Lord himself, and confirmed by Signs and Wonders, and divers Miracles and Gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own Will.

For there is but one Law-giver to the Church, even him who is able to save and to destroy : Hear him in all things whatsoever he hath said unto you. Go in the Footsteps of the primitive and Apostolick Churches ; for that is the right Path, and the good old Way ; walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your Souls. Consider, it is the Word that Christ hath spoken, that shall judg us at the last Day. The Lord help every one of us who enjoy the Light of the Glorious Gospel, to be found obedient thereunto, that so we may receive that blessed Sentence ; *Well done good and faithful Servant, enter thou into the Joy of thy Lord.*

F I N I S.